



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

13 × 16, the Embaterion of the Persians 64, that of Agamemnon 64. That all these coincidences are due to chance is demonstrable.

The Agon is still more stubborn. Eight Epirrhemata with their eight Antepirrhemata are indivisible by 16, and in only one instance of these eight is the number in the Epirrhema the same as that in the Antepirrhema. A panacea is found. All the figures are expanded to the next higher multiple of 16, by assuming a pause in the recitation while the music continued. In one or two cases this seems plausible, in some highly improbable. In the Knights II 68 is in this way expanded to 80, and in the Wasps pauses amounting to 11 tetrameters are necessary. I do not deny the possibility of this; but it is the least satisfactory part of the whole work. And yet, according to Z., the whole theory of epirrhematic composition depends upon the correspondence of Epirrhema and Antepirrhema. It seems to me possible that there should be a correspondence of another sort, which I shall not discuss here. In any case it appears to me that there is an obstacle to exact musical correspondence: sometimes the Epirrhema and Antepirrhema are in different rhythms, anapaestic and iambic, or *vice versa*.¹

The Pnigos of the Parodos shows neither Eurhythmy nor Symmetry, while that of the Parabasis shows Symmetry. In the Agon it shows Symmetry in some cases. In the *παράβασις* proper—the Anapaests—there is no Symmetry. The author challenges any one to produce Symmetry here as readily as he has done it in the epirrhematic parts.

Likewise in the Syzygies, where there is no dance, there is no trace of Eurhythmy or Symmetry.

The work closes with an adverse criticism of the “grosse Responson” theory. At the end are lithographs in the form of spectra, presenting clearly to the eye the complete analysis of several tragedies and comedies.

In my article on the Agon I characterized Zieliński's work as one of great importance. The perusal of several adverse reviews by German scholars has not changed my opinion. That the book contains numerous errors in details, I intimated in that article, and it must be conceded that the tone is rather vigorously polemic, and the self-confidence sometimes too great for security; but it would be an easy matter to point out worse errors in some of the adverse criticisms of the work than in the work itself. Yet it is proper to state that I have not called attention to all the errors I observed, but have merely noted a sufficient proportion of them. To enumerate all the errors and give one-tenth of the truths would make on readers who have not seen it a false impression in regard to the merits of a book which, in my opinion, is destined to create an epoch in the study of the Greek drama.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. Part I. The Archaic Inscriptions and the Greek Alphabet; edited for the Syndics of the University Press by E. S. ROBERTS, M. A. Cambridge, 1887. xxii, 419 pp.

Not the least service rendered the science of Greek epigraphy by Sir Charles Newton, the eminent keeper of the antiquities of the British Museum, was

¹The theory does not demand that the Epirrhema and Antepirrhema should necessarily have the same number of verses, but should each be made up of even Perikopai so that the same music could be used; but the rhythm surely could not change.

his papers on inscriptions in the *Contemporary Review* for December 1876, and in the *Nineteenth Century*, June and August 1878. These papers proved the stimulus to no less than two important works on epigraphy, the one in France, the other in England. Salomon Reinach, in his *Traité d'Épigraphie*, published in 1885, a work which created an epoch in the history of classical philology in a country renowned for its epigraphists, confesses with what admiration he perused the elegant and lucid essays which so happily collected the scattered rays of light cast by the inscriptions upon the political, social and religious life of Greece. Scarcely three years after the publication of Reinach's comprehensive treatise, Mr. Roberts pays his tribute to the same sources of inspiration, now collected by their author in the volume entitled *Essays on Art and Archaeology* (1880).

Greek epigraphy is in fact in the air. The *Corpus* is now progressing towards a second edition; England has already given us a manual of historical inscriptions; Germany, the dialect collection of Cauer, and that of Dittenberger, of wider scope; and latest of all, the last work of Gustav Hinrichs was his *Griechische Epigraphik*, rich here and there in its collection of material, but not animated by that freshness of contact with the inscriptions which is such a happy feature of Reinach's *Traité*. It is no fortuitous circumstance that within the brief compass of three years we should have become richer by no less than three treatises on a subject that had remained, not unexplored, it is true, but not worked up as a whole and in its larger aspects, since the days of Franz' *Elementa*, now nigh half a century. The last decade has been fruitful in discoveries of capital importance, and the time seems to have arrived when at least a preliminary sketch of the work accomplished is possible. We retrace our steps to gain impetus. The great question in the history of the Greek alphabet—when and in what way the Phœnician characters were transplanted to Hellenic soil—has, it is true, as Kirchhoff says in the preface to the fourth edition of his *Studien*, not been settled, but it has been brought much nearer to a definite solution by the results of the work of the last ten years, even though the labors of Taylor, Clermont-Ganneau, Wilamowitz, and Gardthausen be regarded as following a deceptive and unsatisfactory method.

Students of literature are now alive to the necessity of keeping pace with the progress of epigraphical knowledge. Epigraphy and dialectology go hand in hand even in their treatment at the hands of scholars. Franz's *Elementa* remained superseded by another manual for forty-five years, Ahrens' *Dialects* for forty-two years. No one who has not made it his daily occupation to deal with the fascinating problem of the birth and growth of Greek forms, can realize to what extent the dialectologist is indebted to his brother epigraphist. Thus the delimitation by Meisterhans of the date in Attic inscriptions (550 B. C.) before which medial consonants are not geminated; the supposed existence of a sibilant expressed on the Teian *devotio* inscription by T (θαλάτης), and on the Lygdamis inscription by the same character, 'Οατάτιος, the E for η (long e) and nondiphthongal ει, Η = η from \bar{a} (or from $\varepsilon + a$), are points of seeming trivial importance, and yet of no slight value to the investigator of the Hellenic dialects.

Mr. Roberts' volume aims at occupying a position midway between the selections of Cauer, Dittenberger, and Hicks on the one hand, and the treatises

of Reinach and Hinrichs on the other, which profess to deal with all the questions arising from a study of Greek inscriptions. Mr. Roberts aims at supplying the want indicated by Newton in the first of the above mentioned papers: "What is now wanted is a popular work, giving a classification of Greek inscriptions according to their age, country and subject, and a selection of texts by way of samples, under each class." The first volume deals then solely with the *form* of the letters in the inscriptions prior to the adoption of the Ionic alphabet. The second volume will embrace such documents as are of importance from the point of view of subject, dialect, and time, and drawn chiefly from the post-Euclidean period.

A brief introduction gives an historical sketch of the Greek alphabet, comprising a geographical and chronological division of the subject; remarks on the change of the Phoenician characters upon their immigration to Greek soil; a discussion on the sibilants, and the evolution of the guttural and labial aspirates; a statement of the various theories as to the interrelation of the *Eastern* alphabet ($\phi, \chi, \psi = \phi, \chi, \psi$) and the *Western* alphabet ($\chi, \phi, \psi = \xi, \phi, \chi$); and notes on the *abecedaria*. Then follow the inscriptions of the *Eastern* group (pp. 23-195), and of the *Western* group (pp. 196-309), annotated throughout, and a chapter on the Hellenizing alphabets of Phrygia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia, Caria and Hispania (pp. 310-20), without citation of inscriptions. Appendix I deals *inter alia* with the age of the earliest inscriptions from Naucratis (p. 323); Appendix II with supplementary commentaries on such inscriptions as need more elaborate comment than was found possible in the body of the work. This second appendix is valuable for its extensive elucidation of the linguistic and other difficulties occurring in a portion of the Gortyna code, the Sigeum stèle, the *devotio* inscription of Teos, the Halicarnassian law of Lygdamis, the Locrian tables, and especially the Elean monuments. *Addenda nova* present various latest views, a series of tables sums up the contents of the entire work, and a capital index concludes the volume.

Part I supplies the material for estimating the worth of those portions of Reinach's and Hinrichs' works which deal with the outward form and make-up of the inscriptions; and at the same time places the student in possession of the facts by which the various divisions of the alphabet made by Franz, Mommsen, Lenormant, Taylor, and Kirchhoff, may be critically estimated, and by which above all the great question of the origin and history of the complementary (non-Phoenician) signs $\Upsilon, \Phi, \chi, \Psi, \Omega$ may be studied.

Mr. Roberts' entire first volume is a tribute to the genius of Kirchhoff. He has completely absorbed into his text the masterly treatise which has placed Kirchhoff first among living Greek epigraphists. There is no passage of importance in the *Studien* which is not either directly translated or whose content is not reproduced in Mr. Roberts' book. It is solely in the case of the Naucratis question that his allegiance wavers. The argument from proximity has here doubtless caused Mr. Roberts to suspend his judgment between Kirchhoff's and Hirschfeld's plea and that of Mr. E. A. Gardner, though to our thinking the Abu-Simbel inscriptions must be referred to a period prior to those discovered at Naucratis.

With this single exception, then, the volume rests entirely upon the Kirchhoffian arrangement of the Greek alphabets. And not merely in its general features, but even in the smallest details Kirchhoff has been followed, and side-

lights caught up and reflected with a devotion unique among the race of scholars. Kirchhoff's views as to the genesis of the Odyssey have already been adopted *in toto* and worked out in detail, and it is his fortune to have a second book meet a similar fate.

No one can resent such propaganda, for it carries with it the furtherance of the most cautious views, free from any bias as to the relative priority of the Eastern or the Western alphabet. But what the scholar might justly demand is that the author of this valuable work should have brought the question as to the origin of "complementary" signs somewhat nearer its solution. Personal contact with such a wealth of archaic material must beget original conclusions. Yet there is no distinct advance whatsoever. Mr. Roberts evidently holds that he is not called upon to present aught else than an "anticipatory sketch"; whereas a more positive gain to science would have been an attempt at winning new results rather than a collection of that which had already been collected. Of the five hundred inscriptions (without counting coin legends) there is not one that has not been published before.

Now, we may not take issue with Mr. Roberts because he has reached no decision as to whether Ψ comes from the Cyprian Ψ or from an opened loop of *koppa*. But if his acceptance of the Kirchhoffian division into an Eastern and a Western alphabet is a working hypothesis, so far as the student is concerned (p. 3), we hold that the student should have the views antagonistic to, or modificatory of, that of Kirchhoff, presented in more space than half a page of fine print. Imperfect though his description be, Reinach's method of presentation offers a far wider horizon whereby the theories of Franz, Mommsen, Lenormant, and Taylor may be estimated (*Traité*, p. 175-236).

Mr. Roberts' procedure in dealing with the views of other scholars is, in one particular at least, the opposite of that of Hinrichs. Mr. Roberts absorbs into his text whole passages, side comments and single observations of others; Hinrichs, with an overwrought devotion to a sense of justice, quotes the *verba ipsissima* of his authorities, with an utter disregard of the effect upon the mind of the reader, whose nerves are tingling from the effort to read his labyrinthian sentences, rendered the more intricate by his persistent and detailed citation. Mr. Roberts' volume is a model of clearness; every resource of the printer's and editor's art has been called into requisition to clarify an intricate subject; and yet, to our fancy, it had been better to inform the student at the outset that no inconsiderable part of the commentary upon the inscriptions had been directly or indirectly transferred from the pages of others to his own. The criticism on Clermont-Ganneau's theory as to the supplementary signs, the note on the date of the Cretan inscriptions, the commentary on the Lygdamias inscription (No. 145), are nothing more than reproductions of previous comments by Taylor, Comparetti and others, though in the last case we are stimulated by the happy conjecture of $\pi\omega\epsilon\iota\nu$ (l. 8).

We sincerely trust that we are doing Mr. Roberts no injustice, for his aim throughout has been to refer the student to the numerous authorities, quoted with a fidelity that deserves the highest praise, and a completeness that renders his work indispensable. This method of directing the student to other sources of information may have its advantages, but his gain would have been indubitably greater had his zeal been stirred by contact with the editor's personality. The work offers then practically nothing that has not been published some-

where or other. But it is none the less on that account a desirable addition to our apparatus. It achieves a complete success in furnishing us with enlarged appliances for the study of the pre-Euclidean inscriptions found chiefly in Roehl. In felicitousness of grouping, clearness of presentation, completeness of citation of relevant literature, this work far exceeds anything heretofore published. In no other publication can be found such concise and yet such complete introductions to each inscription. The author has spared no pains to bring his book up to date, even to the very day of publication. It indicates the high-water mark of contemporaneous epigraphical science. Omissions to refer to pertinent literature are very rare. In No. 27 (page 67) we miss an allusion to Thuc. V 5 and Fick's *Odysee* (pp. 9-11), where in explanation of the occurrence of *F* in the Chalcidian Ionic of Magna Graecia (*Fiώ, ΩFατίνης, TapvFόvης*) it is plausibly suggested that the dialect was a mixed one, and that the *F*'s are in reality Doric. Certainly the *a* of *TapvFόvης*, which Kirchhoff (*Studien*⁴ 126) attributes to a peculiarity of Chalcidian Ionic, finds an easy explanation in the presence of an admixture of Doric in the western colonies of the Ionians. On page 262 (No. 261) Pischel, in Bezenberger's Beiträge VII 332, might have been adduced; and p. 143 (No. 117), Ugdulena, Sopra una iscrizione Selinuntiana, 1871; p. 218 (No. 208), Schneider, *de dialecto Megarica*, 41-43 (referred to on No. 44a). To No. 145 (p. 174) add *Journal of Hellenic Studies* I. The appearance of the fourth edition of Kirchhoff's *Studien* while Mr. Roberts' pages were in press has enabled references to the *Studien* to be corrected to the paging of the fourth edition. A few passages have escaped Mr. Roberts' cautious eye; e. g., page 215 (No. 204), page 75 (two). In some others Mr. Roberts has failed to notice the change in Kirchhoff's views: thus page 228 = K.³ 132, 133, whereas the passage in question is no longer found in K.⁴ 140. Of far greater moment, however, is the accuracy with which the letters of the inscriptions are reproduced. It is well known that Roehl does not always represent the original with sufficient fidelity; but Mr. Roberts' work fulfills all that might reasonably be expected, both in the facsimiles and in the type copies. In No. 14a, a coin of Gortyna, the *nu*'s and *sigma*'s are not exact; in No. 145 we have a curious instance of the transmission of an error from book to book through mere carelessness. In the first line we have the following letters preserved: . ΑΔΕΘΣ[Υ]ΑΔΟ Δ, which the later editors almost without exception transcribe as follows: *Τάδε ὁ σύλλο[γο]ς ἐβουλεύσατ[ο]* as if the *τ* of *τάδε* and the characters ΣΕΒ Ο ΕΥΣΑΤ were visible and only ΓΟ and Ο had to be supplied; whereas on Mr. Roberts' facsimile there is not a trace of any letter between *συλλο-* and *Δ*, and none from *Δ* to the end. Furthermore, according to Newton, the *Δ* of *ἐβουλεύσατο*, which is undoubtedly preferable to *ἐπικλήτος*, should stand over the *Α* of *Σάλμ-* in the line below; and in the same inscription, line 16, I notice that instead of *ζ* the final letter in Newton's copy is Ξ. It might have been well for convenience to have cited the numbers of Roehl's *Imagines*, as well as those of his *Corpus*.

These are, however, points of trifling moment in comparison with the general trustworthiness of the whole. Mr. Roberts, I see, clings to the spiritus asper in transcribing Ionic inscriptions from Asia Minor, whereas Bechtel has at last broken with the traditional usage; an innovation which finds a partial support in the authority of Herodotus. Why the Doric accentuation should not be introduced is not clear, for forms like *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*, *Ἀθαναῖοι* (No. 258) are

clearly not in line with Doric usage; even if we do not go to the extent of writing ἐπολεμέων in the heading of the famous serpent-coil of Platea, which Mr. Roberts, following Fabricius, now reads τοῖδε τὸν πόλεμον ἐπολέμεον.

The utmost care has been taken to reach the highest degree of accuracy in the make-up of the work. I notice that at least two passages quoted incorrectly by Kirchhoff and G. Meyer, have been quietly corrected in passing. Only the teacher who has used Mr. Roberts' work with students can realize how faithfully the laborious duty of commenting upon so large a number of inscriptions has been performed.

The following observations were jotted down during the perusal of the work: P. xiv: for *Ahrens R.* read *Ahrens H. L.* P. xv: insert Busolt's Griechische Alterthümer (Müller Handbücher IV 1). Kumanudes looks strange under the guise of Cumanudes. P. 8, note 2: for *J. Müller* read *I. Müller*. The German original has slipped in here. It is correct on pp. xv, xvi. P. 33 (and 138): I do not see how there can be any doubt that Γρόφων is a proper name and not a participle. ρο for ρα is not a Doric peculiarity, and from the base *γρεφ- or *γερφ- the ablaut verbal form would be γροφέω. The syntax too makes in favor of a proper name. The reference (top of page 33) to No. 113 should read 113b. P. 83, No. 46a: for πλύνεις read πλυνεύς. In the manumission decrees found recently on the Acropolis and published in the Am. Journ. of Arch. Vol. IV there is mention of the profession together with the name of the person, an occurrence rare in Attic epigraphy according to Köhler, Mitth. X, quoted by Mr. Roberts. P. 107: the inaccuracy of Schütz's tables of the Attic alphabet, reproduced on pp. 106, 107, is evinced in the case of Σ, which, according to these tables, ought after 446 B. C. to have always four strokes; whereas the σ's of Hicks, No. 33 = C. I. A. suppl. I, p. 37, have but three strokes (438 B. C.). P. 115: the change of σ to spiritus asper occurs also in Argolic, e. g. ἐποίφη, I. G. A 42; cf. also Cyprian φρονέω διμώεις. P. 129 (No. 98): Mr. Roberts says that ἥς is apparently found in this inscription and in no other. This is scarcely correct: Arcadian CDI 1122₈₇, Cyprian Berl. Phil. Wochens. 1884, p. 671. P. 129 (No. 98): νθ for λθ is not confined, as Mr. Roberts asserts, to the Greek of Sicily and South Italy with the exception of ἐνθών (Corcyra). We have προαπενθεῖν in Delphic, and even in the MSS of Alcaeus (84) we have ἦνθον. P. 129 (No. 99): on Ἀράλλοιο cf. the suggestion of Allen, *Versification*, p. 77 (Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. IV). P. 143 (No. 117): the ω of τῶς, θεῶς, Σελινώντιοι should yield to ου. See Schneider *de dialecto Megarica*, p. 57. The Megarian dialect follows the Attic procedure. In No. 113b Mr. Roberts reads τοῦ Μαλίον, but in 113 Δυκείω (gen.). P. 154 (No. 130): If [όμ]α is correct, the Η must be a slip. P. 159 (No. 132): against Mr. E. A. Gardner's suggestion that Ἀπόλλω is a vocative, is to be placed Prof. Merriam's happy conjecture that the *sigma* of the supposed σος is in reality a *nu*, Am. Journ. Arch. III 304. P. 169 (No. 142 B 1): The Ionic form is νοῦσος, as in Mimnermus. νοῦσος, Attic νόσος, by the way, cannot be explained from *νογκιος, *νονσος, but is from *νοσφις, cf. Old Norse snauðr, *bereft, bare*, Germ. schnöde. P. 176, line 16 of No. 145, [Φο]ρμίωνος is an easy conjecture. P. 212 (No. 198): add *Eretrian*. P. 218 (No. 208): there can be no question that the κλει- forms come from κλεφε-. P. 226 (No. 233): for φυ[αι?] read φ[αι?]. Roehl, No. 221, has φ[αι?] [ακ]. P. 231: for *fragments* read *payments*. P. 255 (No. 257):

this inscription is preserved, not in the *Βαββακείον* at Athens, but in the Polytechnicum. P. 262 (No. 261): for *Ὀλύμπιε* read *Ὀλύμπιε*. P. 264: for *Hinrichs* (note on line 12) read *Collitz* (*Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse*, etc.) P. 278 (No. 277): *ἐ[μ] Μαννρέαι*, which Mr. Roberts adopts, is very questionable. *ἐν* is at best very rare in Arcadian (see my paper on Arcado-Cyprian, Am. Phil. Assoc. Trans. Vol. XVIII), though it is true we have a case of *ἐν* in No. 277 (epic, despite Meister). P. 287 (No. 291): Mr. Roberts' expulsion of the *ν* in line 10, and his reading *τοῖ <ν> ταύτη [γε] γραμ(u)ένοι* is very doubtful. P. 298: by an omission, the age of No. 300 is not specifically stated; from the context, especially Kirchhoff's note, one might suppose No. 300 belonged to the sixth century, whereas K. expressly states that No. 300 is to be dated about 400 B. C. P. 335: *νάϊε* is written in one case, *Νάϊε* in the other. P. 338: *προδόμεν* is not an Ionic form. P. 339: note on l. 37 seqq. of No. 142. This entire § on *-ει* and *-ηι* in the subjunctive will have to be modified in the light of Schulze's paper in the twenty-second volume of *Hermes*.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

The Fables of Avianus. Edited, with prolegomena, critical apparatus, commentary, excursus and index, by ROBINSON ELLIS, M. A., LL. D. Oxford, 1887. Pp. xlii, 152.

Mr. Ellis has added to the deep obligation under which all students of Late Latin must feel towards him by his present edition of Avianus. The edition is both critical and explanatory. It might have been thought that little yet remained to do in settling the text after W. Fröhner [1862] had published collations of the Paris, and Bährens [*Poetae Latini Minores*, Vol. V] of the Leyden MSS. Mr. Ellis, however, has had his usual good fortune as a discoverer of fresh manuscript material. From the MSS which he has examined or collated at Oxford, Cambridge and London, he selects one [Harley, 4967, not earlier than 1300] as of "unique importance," while three others [all in the Bodleian, and ranging from the eleventh to the beginning of the fourteenth cent.] present numerous readings of interest. He has also collated the best of Fröhner's Paris MSS [C, which he assigns to the tenth cent. at latest]—the enormous Trèves MS of the tenth cent., which Bährens only collated "raptim"—the St. Gallen fragment, etc. It will be seen that this is the fullest critical commentary that has yet appeared; but in spite of the number and comparatively early date of the MSS, the text often stands in need of emendation. The emendations which Mr. Ellis either makes or adopts fall into two classes: (α) emendations of obviously corrupt and unmeaning passages; (β) emendations of metre and syntax, which are based upon general views of what is possible or not in Latin of the epoch of Avianus. (α) The following brilliant examples of the first class may be cited, VII 14: *Tunc insultantem senior de plebe superbum | Adgreditur tali singula uoce monens*, MSS. Mr. Ellis suggests *Adgreditur "tali cingula uoce moues?"* He proves from Varro, as against Servius, that *cingulum* was used for a dog's collar, and compares a similar corruption in the Codex Ambrosianus of Claudian. [Although this is almost convincing, it is perhaps worth while to mention the suggestion of a learned friend: *Adgreditur curta talia uoce monens*. This is based on the view of the Censor of Wopkens that *talia uoce monens* was the